FACTORS IN INDIAN HISTORY

Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, M. A.

ANDHRA UNIVERSITY
WALTAIR
1949

1606

1606

Lectures on

Factors in Indian History

(Sir Alladi KRISHNASWAMI AIYAR Endowment Lectures)

BY

Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, M. A.
(Retd. Professor of Indian History and Archaeology, University of Madras)

Published by
THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY
WALTAIR
1949

PRINTED AT
THE KESARI PRINTING WORKS
T'NAGAR, MADRAS.

1606

Preface

I am grateful to the Andhra University and its esteemed Vice-Chancellor, Sir C. R. REDDY, for their inviting me to deliver the Alladi KRISHNASWAMI AIYAR lectures for this year. This has given me opportunity to bring together my thoughts on India's history and culture. I have laid more stress on the early formative period partly because I am more acquainted with this period, but more for the reason that, in my opinion, it has most to contribute to the shaping not only of our own future but of that of the world. I have too much respect for those who heard these lectures and others who may chance to read them to expect that they will subscribe to all my statements without argument. I cannot also believe that I have succeeded in avoiding all mistakes of fact, much less errors of judgement and emphasis. Historical judgements have no final court of appeal, and if the statement of my views formed after much study and reflection helps others to clear up some questions for themselves and even start looking into them, I can ask for no more.

Nilesvar, Mylapore,
June, 1948.

K. A. N.

FACTORS IN INDIAN HISTORY

The history of Indian culture begins at least five thousand years ago, and possibly much earlier. It is the story of the rise and fortunes of a distinctive outlook and mode of life developed in this vast land of Bhāratavarṣa that witnesses to-day the birth-pangs of a new era of freedom and high endeavour. The present is a very troubled time, but it always is that in some measure everywhere and at all times. And we are naturally apt to magnify the difficulties and dangers in our path, and at times even lose faith in ourselves. To make a broad survey of our past achievement, and to recall the salient features of the problems faced and solved by our ancestors, and the factors, human and other, that have played a part in governing the trends of our history, might help us to view the present in a proper perspective and prepare with intelligence and courage for a future even more splendid than the past.

Time was when Asia led the world in civilization and culture, and India led Asia. China maintained a constant intercourse with India and her colonies in Central Asia, Indo-China and Indonesia, and her sons came to India in their hundreds by land and sea for study at her Universities and for the collection of manuscripts and of pandits who would go to China, translate them into Chinese and expound them to Chinese audiences. The Arabs linked up Asia with Europe, and willy-nilly they became the medium for the transmission to the West of much Indian lore, particularly in mathematics and medicine and in the realm of fables and moral tales. India had a large mercantile marine and her merchants frequented all the leading parts on the vast littoral of the Indian Ocean from Canton to Axum. Not only her pepper and ginger and ivory, but her iron and steel products and her cotton and silk fabrics were eagerly demanded in many foreign lands from the beginning of recorded history almost to the end of the seventeenth century A. D. In more recent times India's literature and philosophy, her religions and philosophical systems have been studied and expounded with understanding and love by many of the scholars of Europe and America. Yet the average school and college histories of India give little idea of the scope and importance of India's achievement in the different departments of human life; by their undue stress on dynastic details and on wars, intrigues and strife, they have brought neither edification nor enjoyment to the student, who therefore goes to the study of the history of his own country with much less enthusiasm than to that of some other countries like England, Greece or Rome. There are at present several schemes for multi-volume histories of India in the field, and one

hopes that when they are completed they would present a cogent and authentic picture of the entire course of the nation's life reviewed from different angles and render the study of India's history much more interesting and fruitful to the general reader. It will be my aim in these lectures to dwell on some of the main factors that have shaped the course of our history and to indicate points of view which have not been so far stressed as much as they deserve in any constructive view of our past. I will seek to interpret the data from the standpoint of our present needs and future plans and will offer no apology for the attempt to link up politics with history. History as such is indeed a scientific discipline in which the student should be ready to go wherever his evidence leads him ; but the conclusions of history will be viewed and understood by each generation according to its own lights.

The land we live in, our habitat, is the first and most enduring of the factors that have shaped our history. We apply the name India now not only to the wide continent stretching southward from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, but also 'to the vast entourage of mountainous plateaux and lofty ranges which remain an everlasting wall between it and the rest of Asia, and across which through all historic ages its land approaches have been found'.[1] India then seems to be shut off effectively from the rest of the world by mountain and sea. But it is easy and not uncommon to exaggerate her isolation, and far too often her history has been presented as one of repeated conquests by invaders who somehow found their way into India across the land barriers until the European nations discovered the all-sea route to India doubling the Cape of Good Hope and began their invasions from the other end. The tacit presumption has all along been that the approaches to India were routes of one-way traffic, opening from outside into India but not from India outside. Some recent authors evince a better appreciation of India's place in the history of the world,[2] but as the force of tradition is still strong, we shall do well to consider in some detail the extent of India's isolation and her passive subjection to external invasions.

The geographical unity of India, the fact that formidable natural barriers constitute her vast area into a distinct region, is quite obvious, and it is this that has enabled her to evolve a stable society and culture that have survived the shocks of ages and has imparted a unique continuity

1. IGI. p. 5. The term India is employed in the lectures in its natural sense to include the whole country irrespective of its recent division into the Dominions of India and Pakistan.

2. E. G. Moreland and Chatterjee, as well as Raychaudhuri in *An Advanced History of India*.

and unity to her history. Let me observe by the way that by stability I do not mean stagnation; when I read in a recent book that the society described in the *Mahābhārata* is not essentially different from what holds its sway in India to-day',[3] I realise the danger of emphasising the stability of our social structure without making it clear at the same time that it has a varied and interesting history of its own for those who can read it. By stability of Indian culture I mean the persistence of its distinctive identity through all its changes, the continuity of life and growth, not the stolidity of inanimate existence.

The North-west of India, the land of the Indus which gives its name to the whole sub-continent, and what lies immediately to the west and north of it, is the key to India proper and to much of her history. Bounded by the great Himalayan range in the north, it is continuous on the south with Hindustan, the vast plain which forms the main part of Northern India. About 3000 B. C. the Indus valley had developed a vigorous urban civilization which maintained a live trade with Mesopotamia, and the Indian seals, beads and pots found in several Mesopotamian cities 'afford conclusive proof of international trade linking the Tigris with the Indus 1200 miles away. They reveal a picture of caravans regularly crossing the ragged ranges and salt deserts that separate the two valleys, or of fleets of dhows sailing along the waterless coasts of the Arabian sea between the rivers' mouths'.[4] It became part of the Achamenid empire of Persia in the sixth century and remained in it until Alexander came to complete his overthrow of the Persian empire by doing away with the last vestiges of Persian rule in India. Partly by conquest and partly by the gift of Seleucus, it came into the Mauryan empire and shared its extensive and valuable diplomatic and commercial contacts with the Hellenistic states of the West. The careers of Demetrius, Eukratides, Menander and other Indo-Greek rulers, as well as those of the more important Kuṣāṇa rulers linked its fortunes for many generations with those of Bactria and Central Asia, and there is clear evidence of renewal of contact with Persia under the Sassanids in the third century A. D. Great centres of trade and culture like Kāpiśa and Takṣaśilā flourished in the midst of all these political vicissitudes, and the course of international trade accumulated there, especially after the establishment of the *Pax Romana* in the west, vast quantities of precious merchandise from the Levant, from the interior of India and from Central Asia.[5] It is

---

3. K. M. Panikkar: *A Survey of Indian History*, p. 2.

4. Childe: *Man Makes Himself*, (Thinkers' Library Edn.), p. 150.

5. Foucher: *India Antiqua*, pp. 124-5.

becoming more and more evident with the progress of research that the cultures of India, Iran and China met and mingled for many centuries in the states of Central Asia among which lay the routes followed by numerous pilgrims from China who generation after generation made it a point to visit the holy land of Buddhism to gain inspiration and gather the sacred books.

In the north-east there are indeed some routes connecting India with Upper Burma and Arakan, but the heavy rainfall of this region concentrated in a third of the year washes away the tracks and promotes a dense growth of forest which tends to close the routes altogether in a short time. Still they were availed of to a limited extent by the Hindu colonists who went to Indo-China in the early centuries of the Christian era as well as by traders who moved occasionally in either direction. The short rule of a Tibetan dynasty in North Bengal in the tenth century, the incoming of the Ahoms three centuries later into Assam, and an unsuccessful Burmese invasion of Assam in 1816 are indications that these old routes never went altogether out of use[6]. And we know that under the stress of the Japanese occupation of Burma large nnmbers of Indians braved the inclemencies of these unfrequented routes to make their escape into India.

From the earliest times the sea has served more as a highway than as a barrier, and as Yule said, 'the more we learn the further goes back the history of Eastern Navigation.' Though the Indian Ocean is not a closed basin like the Mediterranean, the prevalence of currents and periodical winds has always maintained a maritime system of exchanges in which India by virtue of her central position played the dominant role. The African coast, Arabia and the Persian Gulf in the West, and Insulindia, and Indo-China and China in the East, formed essential parts of this system. The evidence of language and archaeology attests in an unmistakable manner the relations that India had with Indonesia in the East and with Mesopotamia and the Levant in the West in prehistoric times.[7] The vast movement of colonisation towards the East, and the extensive commerce with the Roman empire in the West that form the most important phases of South Indian history in the early centuries of the Christian era were only the maintenance in historical times of contacts established long before the commencement of recorded history. The Sātavāhanas enjoyed the title of *Trisamudrādhipatis*, Lords of the three oceans, and some coins of the dynasty bearing the effigy of a double-masted ship attest the active interest of the people in sea-faring

6. J. N. Sarkar: *India Through the Ages*, p. 7.

7. See my paper on *Southern India, Arabia and Africa* in NIA I.

and overseas trade. The Pallava Nandivarman III held sway over the western part of the Malay peninsula and the Cōla emperors waged successful naval war with the Sumatran empire of Śrīvijaya when it sought to throw obstacles in the way of their intercourse with China. They also controlled Ceylon and the Maldives for a long period.

When the full import of facts like these is realised and a comprehensive view is taken of India's relations with her neighbours in the early periods of her history, it becomes evident that it is easy to exaggerate her isolation and attribute an undue importance to the 'barriers' of sea and mountain that cut her off from the rest of the world. Her geography imposed a certain undeniable unity on the whole land, but by no means sealed her off from fertilising contacts with her neighbours.

The stupendous mountain system of the Himalayas, bounded on the north-west by the great bend of the Indus and on the north-east by that of the Brahmaputra, separates Northern India from Tibet and dominates the southern plain, its physical features and its climate. From the great central range of snow peaks to the Gangetic plain, 'there exists a width of about 100 miles of mountains comprising many minor ranges, steep-sided and deeply corroded by river action' and approximately parallel with the strike of the great central range. This extensive and awesome mountain country 'with a climate and vegetation ranging between the arctic and tropical' and its infinitely varied conditions of life is only partially known to us and hardly enters into the main story of India's civilization. But its importance to that story can hardly be overrated. From Simla eastwards, its southern slopes are drained by the Gangā and its great tributaries the Jumnā, the Gogrā and the Gaṇḍak which provide an assured water supply for the extensive Gangetic plain and 'carry fertility and wealth to the plains of Bengal. Tracing magnificent curves through the flat lowlands, the four rivers have for centuries combined to form on overruling factor in the development of the Indian peoples. No river on the surface of the globe can compare with the Gangā in sanctity'.[8] Across the Himalayas, there are just three groups of passes leading into Tibet—one along the valley of Sutlej, another near Almora and the chief affluent of the Gogrā to the east of Almora, and a third across the northern barriers of the state of Sikkim. But 'none of them is passable except for trade purposes; none of them at present contributes anything material to the commercial prosperity of India.'

8. Imp. Gaz. i. p. 23.

The fertile basin of the Gangā is indeed the heart of India. Here rose 'the chief kingdoms of the plains, the most ancient cities, the earliest centres of civilization, of industry, and of wealth' in historical times. Here was the home of Indian civilization which set the standard of *mores* for the rest of the country. Thus one of the earliest authors on Dharma, Baudhāyana says: [9]

Prāg-adarśanāt pratyak-kālakavanāt dakṣiṇēna
Himavantam udak-Pāriyātram ētad Āryāvartam
tasmin ya ācārassa pramāṇam.

i. e. East of the disappearance (of the river Sarasvatī), west of the Kālaka forest, south of the Himavān and north of Pāriyātra—this (land) is Āryāvarta; what is practised there is the standard (for the rest of the country). Manu is much more elaborate on this point and it would be worth our while to give our attentton to him and his expositors. Manu says: [10]

Sarasvatī Dṛṣadvatyōr-dēvanadyōr-yadantaram /
tam dēvā nirmitam dēśam Brahmāvartam pracakṣate //
tasmin dēśē ya ācāraḥ pāramparyakramāgataḥ /
varṇānām sāntarālānām sa sadācāra ucyate //

i.e. 'That land, created by the gods, which lies between the two divine rivers Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī (the sages) call Brahmāvarta. The custom handed down in regular succession (since time immemorial) among the (four chief) castes (*varṇa*) and the mixed (castes) of that country, is called the conduct of virtuous men'.[11]

Neither of the two rivers mentioned is traceable any more, and the Sarasvatī had begun to lose itself in the sands of Rajaputana even in Baudhāyana's time. The other stream is believed to have flowed through Ambala and Sirhind,[12] so that we have to assume that the Brahmāvarta of Manu lay in the extreme east of modern Punjab. The verses that follow in Manu are of great interest as revealing the traditional appraisal of the cultural history of Northern India :

Kurukṣētram ca Matsyaścā Pāncālāś Śūrasēnakāh /
ēṣa Brahmarṣidēśō vai Brahmāvartādanantaraḥ //
ētad-dēśa-prasūtasya sakāśād-agrajanmanaḥ /
svam svam caritram śikṣēran pṛthivyām sarvamānavāḥ //
Himavad-Vindhyayōr-madhyam yatprāg-vinaśānadapi /

9. I, i,ii, x.
10. II,17-18.
11. SBE. XXV p. 32
12. N. L. Dey *Geographical Dictionary of Ancient India.*

pratyagēva Prayāgāc-ca-Madhyadēśaḥ prakīrtitaḥ //
ā-samudrāt-tu vai pūrvād-ā-samudrāt-tu paścimāt /
tayōr-ēvāntaram giryōḥ Āryāvartam vidurbudhāḥ //
kṛṣṇasārastu carati mṛgō yatra svabhāvataḥ /
sa jnēyō yajṇīyō dēśō Mlēcchadēśas-tvataḥ paraḥ //
ētān dvijātayō dēśān saṁśrayēran prayatnataḥ /

i. e. 'The plain of the Kurus, the (country of the) Matsyas, Pāncālas, and Śūrasēnakas, these (form), indeed, the country of the Brahmarṣis (Brahmanical sages, which ranks) immediately after Brahmāvarta.

'From a Bṛahmaṇa born in that country, let all men on earth learn their several usages.

'That (country) which (lies) between the Himavat and the Vindhya (mountains) to the east of Vinaśana (the place where the river Sarasvatī disappears) and to the West of Prayāga (Allahabad) is called Madhyadēśa (the central region).

'But the tract between those two mountains (just mentioned) which (extends) as far as the eastern and the western oceans, the wise call Āryāvarta (the country of the Aryans).

'That land where the black antelope naturally roams, one must know to be fit for the performance of scrifices; (the tract) beyond that (is) the country of the Mlēcchas (barbarians).

'Let twice-born men make an effort to live in these lands.'

Here we find Manu detailing a rather nice gradation of regions according to their cultural purity and importance. Next to E. Panjab in cultural eminence, he ranks Brahmarṣidēśa, the Jumna-Gangā doab from round about Delhi, the plain of the Kurus, to Mathurā, the capital of the ancient Śūrasēnakas and makes the Brāhmaṇa born in that region an authority on proper social usages. Subject to a reservation due to our ignorance of the exact location of Kālakavana of Baudhāyana, we may be justified in assuming that his Āryāvarta roughly corresponds to the Madhyadēśa of Manu, the term Āryāvarta being employed by Manu in a much more extended sense, nearly coinciding in significance with the modern term Hindustan. In these different terms for the cultural divisions of N. India we have clear evidence of the varying degrees of the Aryanisation of the different parts of the country and of the recognition of these differences by the tradition of the country. This tradition influenced the motives and actions of men through many centuries, and throughout the whole of India. To it we must trace the eagerness of the

rulers of the Deccan and South India, to trace their descent from the Purāṇic dynasties of the North claiming to be of the line of the Sun, the Moon or Agni (Fire). To it also we must ascribe the claim of several rulers that their ancestors took part in the great Mahābhārata war, a claim made on behalf of the three crowned monarchs of the South, the Pāṇḍya, Cēra, and Cōḷa almost from the beginning of the Christian era. The tendency to import Brahmans from the banks of the Gangā for the conduct of worship in temples, and for running *āśramas* and *Tapōvanas* can be traced in the inscriptions of South India till relatively recent times. Sivaji and his successors looked to the learned men of Benares for guidance on doubtful points of politics and sociology. We may note that Mēdhātithi, the earliest extant commentator on Manu, points out that Madhyadēśa got its name not because it was the centre of the earth but owing to its being neither too high nor too low in the cultural scale—*Nātyutkṛṣṭō nātinikṛṣṭa ityatō Madhyadēśō natu pṛthivī-madhya - bhāvatvāt.*[13] Again the same learned writer explains the name of the extended Āryāvarta of Manu in a manner that is of great interest to us. He says: *aryā vartante tatra punaḥ punarudbhavanti| ākramyā-kramyāpi na ciram tatra mlēcchāḥ sthātārō bhavanti;* i. e. Āryas recur there, rise up again and again; though they may occupy it repeatedly, barbarians do not flourish there long - clear recognition of the repeated inroads of foreigners into India and of the fact that till the time when Mēdhātithi wrote (ninth century A. D.) the foreigner who entered India soon lost his identity in the Hindu fold. Though writing long after the establishment of Muslim rule in Delhi, Kullūka-bhaṭṭa repeated the etymology of Medhātithi, though he naturally dropped the accompanying comment on the *mlēcchas.* All are agreed that the seas are mentioned only as the boundary of Āryāvarta, the islands in the ocean not being included. Let us note the further evidence furnished by Manu of the progress of Aryanisation of India since the age of Baudhāyana. Having stated the superior position of Āryāvarta in cultural evolution, he adopts the performance of Vedic sacrifices as the symbol of high culture and states in general terms that all lands where the black antelope is seen in natural condition may also be considered fit venues for their performance of sacrifices, i. e. for occupation by Āryas. This concession is certainly meant to cover the case of new lands south of the Vindhyas that had already received the imprint of Aryan culture before the Manusmṛti assumed its present form. And once more Mēdhātithi who alone discuss-

---

13. A later commentator Sarvajna Narayana, however, holds the contrary view ruled out by Medhatithi and says: *Madhyah prithivya jaghanasthaniyo desah.* Other annotators treat it simply as a proper name,

es this verse at consi derable length is seen obviously interpreting its implications in the light of subsequent history. He points out that even countries called 'barbarian' may under conditions become fit for the performance of sacrifices if a virtuous king conquers that land and creates the social milieu appropriate for the purpose, just as even Brahmāvarta might conceivably become *mlēccha-dēśa* if occupied by *mlēcchas* for any length of time; in other words a country is *mlēccha or ārya* according to circnmstances.[14] Who can deny that Mēdhātithi had before his mind the incidents that marked the foreign inroads into India on the one hand, and on the other the expansion of Indian culture in the colonies established beyond the seas ?

The Vindhyas divide the Deccan from North India, again not in a way that cut off intercourse between the two regions. Agastya is now generally recognised as the personification of the expansive force of Indo-Aryan culture, and the legends which credit him with the subjugation of the Vindhyas and the drinking up of the waters of the ocean are rightly interpreted as allegories closely related with the spread of that culture first across the whole continent of India and then to the colonies beyond the seas. On the mainland the sage gets a home in the extreme south of the peninsula in the Podiya hills. It is a mistake to treat the history of ancient and mediaeval India, as is often done, as if it concerned only the North, and the South did not matter. The regions may be treated separately for convenience of study, but an integral view of the development of the culture of the country must take account of all its regions at every step. In early times not only did the sages and warriors who colonized the south evolve successfully a most remarkable similarity in the culture goods of the different parts of India, but the Mauryan and Sātavāhana empires linked even the political fortunes of the North and South in an indissoluble manner for several generations. The martial career of Samudragupta, the dynastic connections of the Vākāṭakas with

---

14. *Prāyēṇa hyēṣu dēśēṣu mlēcchā bhavanti. natvanēna dēśasambandhēna mlēcchā vakṣyantē. svatas-tēṣām prasiddhēḥ brāhmaṇādi-jātitvāt. athārthadvārēnāyam śābdaḥ pravṛtto mlēcchānām dēśa iti. tatra yadi katham-cit Bramāvartādi dēśam api mlēcchā ākramēyuḥ tatraivāvasthānam kuryur - bhavēdēvā-sau mlēcchadēśaḥ. tathā yādi kaścit kṣatriyādi jatīyō-rājā sādhvācaraṇō mlēcchān parājayēta cāturvarṇyam vāsayēt mlēcchāmśca Āryavarta - iva cāṇḍālān vyavasthāpayēt sōpi syād - yajniyaḥ. yato na bhūmiḥ svatō duṣtā samsargāddhi sā duṣyaty-amēdhyōpahatēva ata uktadēśa-vyatirēkēṇāpi sati sāmagrye traivarṇikēnā-kṛṣṭa-mṛgācaraṇēpi dēśē yaṣṭavya-mēva.*

the Guptas in the North and the Kadambas in the South, the northern expeditions of the Cāḷukyas of Bādāmi and Harṣa's attempt, though not successful, to extend his rule south of the Vindhyas, the repeated Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasions of North India, are constant reminders through the centuries that the interaction between the North and the South was a constant and important factor in the historical and cultural development of India. In later times the story of Turkish and Mughal rule in Delhi and that of the Marathas enforce the same lesson till the unification of India under a centralized modern government by the British gave a stable political expression to the basic cultural unity of the land which had been attained almost at the dawn of history. Malava and Orissa, and the Bahmani kingdom and its succession states always bore two faces, as it were, one turned to the North and the other to the South. Likewise it is easy to exaggerate the separation of the western half of Deccan from the eastern, and of both from South India across the line of the Tungabhadrā and the Krishnā or rather Peṇṇār. Any attempt to trace even in outline the history of any of these regions would be doomed to failure unless it took account at every step of contemporary events in the other tracts. The study of our past is still only in its initial stages, and it was perhaps inevitable that we should begin with accounts of individual dynasties in order to secure a dependable chronological framework; but the time has come to shift the emphasis from the study of dynasties in separate monographs, to that of inter-relations among them and the movement of politics and culture in the country as a whole. And we should do well never to forget that politics had not become that obsession which it is with us in the atmosphere of a still new and somewhat precarious freedom won after generations of subjection to foreign rule; our ancestors shaped their conduct in accordance with another scale of values which, though different from ours, will be seen to have some claim to our attention. To view the history of India merely as a narrative of political events is to mistake the frame for the picture. The apparent fragmentation of Indian politics finds its corrective in the broad sweep and rational growth that characterises her religion, her philosophy and her art.

From very early historical times the unity of Bhāratavarṣa was emphasised and a conscious attempt made to promote intercourse between its far-flung provinces by the choice location of important shrines and *tīrthas* at the extremities of the country, and holding up the prospect of substantial rewards both in this world and the next for the performance of pilgrimages to these places. Sōmanāth, Dwārakā and Hinglaj in the west, and Kāmākhyā and Puri (Jagannāth) in the east, Hardwār and

Badri in the north, and Kanyākumārī and Rāmēśvaram in the south count among the holiest centres of Hinduism and this is not an accident. We have only to name other places in the interior like Ujjain, Kurukṣetra, Mathurā and Brindāvan, Kāśī and Gayā, Ayōdhyā and Māyā in the north, and Pandharpur, Drākṣārāma, Śrīśailam, Tirupati, Kāñcī and Śrīrangam in the south for any one to realise that for long ages India has meant for every Indian nothing less than the entire length and breadth of this vast country. No wonder, the most comprehensive political manual of the country, the Arthaśāstra includes the whole of this area in its concept of the Cakravartikṣētram. [15]

The climate of India has often been held to account for much of her history. To writers of this way of thinking the history of India is no more than a monotonous repetition of foreign invasions and conquests generally from the North-West until the Europeans came by sea to reverse the line of conquest in modern times. The climate of India, it is said, is unfavourable to exertion and enervating in its effects. The fertility of the soil renders exertion unnecessary by ensuring an easy food supply, which in its turn provokes an undue fecundity in the population, disease, famine and war being the only checks on its growth. Under such conditions the people never found it possible to build up a proper standard of life; they developed no political consciousness, and patiently submitted to whoever came and claimed rule over them; life they deemed to be a misery, escape from which was the highest bliss. Even vigorous races that came from outside soon succumbed to the deleterious influence of the Indian climate and merged in the population and came to share their gloomy outlook in a few generations. The British rulers of India escaped the fate only by treating India as a colony of exploitation (*colonie d' exploitation*) and not one of settlement (*colonie de peuplement)*. There are many variations of this chain of ideas which recur in most works on Indian history and civilization and in more general works on the philosophy of history. I shall cite just two instances which may serve as illustrations of what I mean. Readers of Lane—Poole's brilliant book on *Mediaeval India* in the Story of the Nations Series will recollect the vivid contrast he draws between the ruddy men in boots who descended on India with Babar from Central Asia and the pale persons in petticoats who went to war in palanquins in the time of Aurangazeb. Here, again, is a more deliberate judgement on Indian culture and the way climate has damaged it. 'The Vedas, it is true',

---

[15] K. A. IX (1) and *Cakravarti Ksetram* by the present writer in K. V. Rangaswamy Aiyangar commemoration volume 1940; pp. 81—6.

says G. L. Dickinson, [16] 'reflect an attitude to life similar to that of the Western Aryans; but this essentially active, positive, optimistic view gradually clouds over. The cause, perhaps, is the influence of climate, of a nature too strong for man. No impression remains more vivid with me of my visit to India than the dominance of nature, and the impotence and insignificance of man. But whatever the cause, there is no doubt about the fact. Indian society became impregnated with the sense of nothingness of life in time. To escape, not to dominate, became the note of their religion. And life being insignificant, history, of course, was so too. It is not an accident, it is a consequence of their attitude to life, that there are no Hindu historians. Contrast the Mahomedans, contrast the Chinese, contrast the Western nations. How can you write the history of a nightmare? You don't do that. You 'try to wake up.' It is a merit of Dickinson that he is not dogmatic in his statement; he just suggests the influence of climate, refers to his own personal experience of it, but then glozes over it with but 'whatever the cause.' He has no doubt, however, on the Indian attitude to life, and asserts that the absence of Hindu historians is a natural consequence of it. As a matter of fact, the undue stress on the influence of climate is the result very often of a serious ignorance or distortion of the true facts of history, and a persistent misunderstanding of Indian philosophy. The portrayal of India as a patient, long-suffering, oft-invaded country, is part of an imperialist propaganda, possibly not quite conscious, which sought a foil against which to set off the external security that the Britisher had secured for India. But such a picture fails to take account of the fact that in all his whirlwind career of conquest Alexander met with any resistance worth the name only in the mountain fastness of North India, and that the battle of the Jhelam while it was indeed a victory also set the limit to his conquests. As a modern historian of Persia put it: [17] 'The Macedonians, in spite of their splendid victory, felt depressed at the stubborn valour displayed by the Indians and also on account of their losses, which were comparatively heavy............Hearing that the country farther east was governed by powerful monarchs whose war elephants and armies were stronger and more numerous than those of Porus, they began to hold meetings at which the speakers all declared that they had gone far enough, that thay were tired of endless marches and battles, and wished to return home to enjoy what they had so hardly earned'. Though much against his will, Alexander had to return. It is well known how his political arrangements in the Panjab were overthrown soon after his de-

---

[16] *Essay on the Civilizations of India, China and Japan*, 1913, pp 14-5.
[17] Sykes, vol I. p. 273.

parture by the founder of the Mauryan empire. Again, in the epoch that followed the end of that empire, the North-West of India may be said to have entered the Western and Central Asian state system for some centuries as it did once before under the Achaemenids, as Pakistan is seeking to do in our own day. The rule of the Bactrian Greeks, and the Śakas, Pahlavas and Kuṣāṇas and even the Parthian kings becomes more intelligible when viewed from this standpoint, and there is much evidence at hand to show that in this epoch of sustained foreign contacts India gave at least as much as she took in the realms of culture and commerce. To represent the period as one of repeated and unmeaning foreign inroads altogether misses its significancc. Again it is often forgotten that India was the only country in the East which beat back Islam in the first onset of its fury which carried everything before it from the Gibraltar to the Indus. The Pratīhāras and Cālukyas threw the Arab invaders out of their territories and confined them to Sind. And when nearly three centuries later the onset was renewed from another quarter and by even more determined votaries of this 'religion of peace' which counts war on the *Kafir* (Jahad) their most sacred duty, it took them not less than two centuries of hard struggle to secure a sufficient hold for them to set about organizing a kingdom; Rajputana was never completely subdued, and Vijayanagar kept Islam out of the South; and the Muslim states even in North India had to dilute the Islamic polity very considerably and enter into many compromises with their subjects even to gain the appearance of peace and order in them. Did the states in Europe offer greater resistance to Hitler, either physically or in spirit ? The decadence of the Moghul grandees of Aurangazeb's court should find its correct explanation in the conditions of Mughal rule in India with which the climate of the country had little to do. Each noble had unlimited power over considerable areas and enormous opportunities of accumulating wealth; the wealth he left behind at the end of his life was the property not of his children but of the emperor; is it any wonder that he contracted habits of extravagance and luxury which soon rendered him unfit for the hardships of a military camp? If climate was the cause of the effeminacy of Mughal soldiers, how are we to explain the hardihood of the Marathas and the daring and courage of the Sikhs ? There is nothing indicating any lack of vitality in Sivaji and Ranjit Singh and their followers. Nor in the life of Mahatma Gandhi who abjured violence even more completely than Aśoka, not to retire into a forest for day-dreaming, but to lead a great nation to the fulfilment of its destiny.

Nothing in the world has perhaps been more often misquoted by Western writers and more completely misunderstood than Indian

philosophy of the advaita Vedānta, and the Buddhist doctrine of Nirvāṇa. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that Nirvāṇa is not nothingness or void, but exactly like the *mokṣa* of all other schools of Hinduism, a state of eternal bliss. Here, for instance, is Aśvaghoṣa on the subject saying that passion, the thirst for possession and enjoyment, is the root cause of troubles and dissatisfactions, and that their control leading to their cessation results in the dawn of eternal happiness. [18]

tajjanmano naikavidhasya saumya
tṛṣṇādayo hetava ityavetya /
tāmṣ-chindhi duḥkhād-yadi nirmumukṣā
kāryakṣayaḥ kāraṇasamkṣayāddhi //

duḥkhakṣayo hetuparikṣayācca
śāntam śivam sākṣikuruṣva dharmam /
tṛṣṇāvirāgam layanam nirodham
sanātanam trāṇam ahāryam-āryam //

yasmin na jātir na jarā na mṛtyuḥ
na vyādhayo nāpriyasamprayogaḥ /
necchāvipanna - priyaviprayogaḥ
kṣamam padam naiṣṭhikam accyutam tat //

Can there be a greater travesty than to represent this ideal of the cessation of misery *(duḥkhakṣaya)*, of eternal release (*sanātanam trāṇam)*, of unabated perfection *(padam naiṣṭhikam acyutam)* as a philosophy of despair? And notice also this—the path is recommended for one who elects to reach the goal—*duḥkhād yadi nirmumukṣā*, i. e. one who has drunk life to the lees and realized the vanity of human wishes at the end of a full life. No, Buddhism is 'not a stately flight of steps that leads nowhere', but a joyous, pragmatic view of life resulting in thousands of *vihāras* and great schools of architecture, sculpture and painting.

About *advaita vedānta* we must insist that the doctrine of *māyā* as stated by Śankara does *not* affirm that the phenomenal world is unreal, much less that it is an illusion, but only that it is an inexplicable mystery (*anirvacanīya*) especially when considered in its relation to Reality; the world is false or unreal (*mithyā*) not to us who are engaged in its affairs, and are concerned actively to promote the progress of society, but to those fewest of the few who have chosen to tread the path to realisation of Truth and have attained the goal. The social ethics that flows out of this philosophy has been propounded in the clearest and most moving terms in the *Bhagavad gītā*: it is a code of the most active and self-less

[18] **Saundarananda XVI, 25-27.**

well-doing for the good of fellowmen. And yet, a Roman Catholic priest who ought to have known better has seriously advanced the proposition that to the followers of the *advaita vedānta* there was no difference between truth and falsehood, and that they made no bones about forging documents to bolster up a myth that redounded to their profit. I shall quote the words of the writer to leave you in no lurking doubt about the matter : 'Such religious ascetics and recluses', this writer assures us, [19] ' psychologically are the persons often inclined to fabricate such fables. Their knowledge of what they call absolute reality, acquired only by their practice of asceticism, inclines them to place all other things, whether existing or not existing, whether true of false, on the same level of relative reality. Hence the fabrication of a story which one might derive a profit from - provided no harm should result from the concoction to a third person - is always attractive to such religious recluses. Hence it may be concluded that the asestics of the ṣringeri math fabricated the story of Vidyāraṇya as the founder of the city and empire of Vijayanagara, in the beginning of the XVI century'. This pitiful stuff, the ignorance of which is matched only by its malice, passes for research !

The philosophy of *advaita* is in fact the highest peak in the philosophical thought of India as competent judges have not failed to recognise. It is not a philosophy of pessimism or despair, and the climate of India has nothing more to do with it than with the Binomial Theorem.

History, as we understand it, is a product of modern thought and study even in the West, aud regular narratives of public events like those of Herodotus and Thucydides, Livy and Polybius were the exception rather than the rule in ancient and mediaeval times. In spite of their admitted merits, these works are mixed up with much that is legendary and fabulous, and the so-called historians often invented speeches which they put into the mouth of historical characters and otherwise drew largely upon their imagination. For long ages history, when it was not a dry chronicle maintained in monasteries, courts and elsewhere, was looked upon as a branch of literature, and modern historians have had to exercise great care in their use of professed histories of antiquity and the Middle ages. The most notable exception to this common practice before the nineteenth century is in fact to be found in India in the regular succession of Arabic and Persian historians of the Islamic world, of whom quite a considerable number lived and did their work in India. And their example did not fail to appeal to some Hindu writers, most notably Kalhaṇa of Kashmir who lays down several very correct principles of historiography and practises them to the extent to which the materials at

---

[19] H. Heras: *Beginnings of Vijayanagara History*, p. 34.

his disposal allowed him to do so. The normal Hindu attitude to history, however, was different. It was not one of indifference born of a disgust with life in time, but a desire to view human affairs against the universal background of nature and of divinity. There is a Greek tradition that an Indian sage who visited Socrates asked the Greek philosopher what he was engaged on; the reply was that he was interesting himself in the study of men and their ways; the Indian thereupon asked him what he knew of the ways of the gods, and when Socrates confessed his ignorance on that subject, the Indian just smiled and said that men could not be understood without a correct knowledge of gods and super-men. Now that story may or may not be true ; but it gives a correct account of the Indian attitude to human events, and goes far to explain the scope and content of the numerous *purāṇas*, *upa-purāṇas*, and *sthalapurāṇas* - all conceived as narratives of universal evolution meant for the education and edification of the populace. We of the twentieth century A. D. have a natural and insuperable difficulty in sharing or approving their view of the matter, but our ancestors were far from being indifferent to the progress of the world they inhabited. Only their accounts of the world began with the creation, traversed the whole domain of myth and fable they cherished about gods and their *avatārs* and the numerous classes of superhumans, and gave only a very subordinate place to what we should call history. This tendency to link up the human with the superhuman is a constant trait of the ancient Indian mode of thought. It accounts for the anxiety of our royal dynasties to trace their descent from the sun and the moon, for the form of our two great national epics the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* which doubtless envelope a core of history in many sheaths of imaginative embellishment, and for the fact that even professedly historical works like Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita*, Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkadēvacaritra*, the *Kalingattupparaṇi* of Jayamkoṇḍār and the *Mūvar-ula* of Oṭṭakkūttan, and the *Periyapurāṇam* of S̈ekkiḻār, to mention only a few well-known instances, often move on the borderland between fact and fable. On the other hand professedly mythological works like Pampa's *Bhārata* and Ranna's *Gadāyuddha* often contain the most valuable references to contemporary historical events which admirably supplement our gleanings on these matters from the inscriptions. Despite their imperfection as hiotory, these works, particularly the epics and the hagiologies have been potent factors in shaping the life of the people. Even so recent a writer as Jayaram Pinde, the court-poet of Shahji, in his *Rādhā-Mādhava vilāsa-Campū* (C. A. D. 1660) invents a conversation between the Lord of the Universe and Brahmā, the Creator, to proclaim the greatness of his hero. He writes :

Jagadīśa Virinciku pūchata haiṁ
Kaho sṛṣṭi racī, rakha kōna kahāṁ
Sasi vo ravi purava paścima lōṁ
tuma soya raho sirasindhu mahāṁ
aru uttara dacchina racchanako
ita Sahaji haiṁ, uta Sājahāṁ

The sting of the conceit is in its tail; the poet roundly affirms the parity of Shahji with Shah Jahan. But no one was misled by the conventions of our 'literary histories' if we may so call them, and there is no lack of downright statements of facts in the voluminous epigraphy and literatures of our country of which the close study for historical purposes is still only in its initial stages.

True it is that the strongly traditional character of our culture, of its literature and its arts had led to greater emphasis on the achievement of tasks than on the persons or the epochs connected with it, and very often we are treated to details which we should gladly exchange for some others on which no light is forthcoming. Vālmīki and Vyāsa are but shadowy names, and even Kālidāsa is very largely so; while we can see and admire the glory of the Kailās at Ellorā or the superb excellence of the paintings at Ajaṇṭā and Bagh, we do not know anything of the names and lives of the painters, architects and sculptors who created these wonders. But this is true in some measure of all climes and ages, and for a parallel we may go to the great cathedrals of mediaeval Europe. Only a little study and reflection are required to show that people in India did not in any way differ fundamentally in their attitude to life and its opportunities from other nations of the world. Speaking generally, and subject to the one reservation that has just been made, they were not perceptibly behind their contemporaries in other lands in the creation and enjoyment of the amenities of a complex civilization, or even in their desire to be remembered by posterity for what they were and what they did. The hundreds of short votive inscriptions recording the names, purposes and objects of the gifts, the many longer inscriptions recording the genealogies and achievement of long lines of rulers before coming to the actual business on hand, among which those of Deccan and South India take a very prominent place, the Musical inscription of Mahēndravarman at Kuḍumiyāmalai, the numerous signed sculptures on the walls of Hoysala temples in Mysore, the several temple chronicles some of which have survived after many have been destroyed, the *praśastis* at the beginning and the colophons at the end of most literary works giving authentic details of the lives of the authors and their patrons, are enough

to repudiate the suggestion that to the Indian his life was 'a nightmare', an experience not worth remembering or recording. Dicksinson's rhetorical contrast between Indians and others in their outlook on life and history is superficial and overdrawn. Our quarrel is not with Dickinson's reaction to the climate of India, natural to any visitor of his type; it is with those books on India which he must have read before he penned his essay and which produced on his mind impressions which he has so tersely summed up.

II.

So far we have discussed the role of India's geography and her climate as factors in the shaping of her history. We shall now turn for a moment from the theatre to the actors. A good deal has already been said by implication about them, because, firstly our interest in the physical features of India lay primarily in the manner in which her people reacted to them in the course of generations and centuries; and secondly, while we may speak of each factor in its turn for convenience of discourse, they all acted together in close mutual connection and it would be impossible to deal with any one of them without bringing in some at least of the others. I have two other preliminary observations to make before entering upon this part of our subject. One is that we shall do well not to think of different races, but only of different cultures. Anthropologists are now generally agreed that race-types so-called are no more than theoretical postulates with no counterparts in the realm of fact. However far we may go back in the history of man, we find him still a mongrel displaying mixed traits of diverse origin. It is well known that among the skeletal remains of Mohenjo Daro anthropologists have recognised what they call the Mediterranean, Proto-Australoid, Mongoloid, and Alpine types—practically all the main race types known to their 'science'. It is equally clear now that the Indo-Aryans had met and mingled with the peoples of Asia Minor, Mesopotamia and Iran before they found their way to India. Differences in language, beliefs and customs are tangible facts, though they too undergo constant mutation by fresh contacts; but differences in race, and more so allegations that particular groups belong to this race or that, have no justification whatsoever. The second observation is this. Some are inclined to feel that it is detraction from the integrity of Indian culture to admit that any traits of it came from abroad. It is this kind of a feeling that seems to prompt them to embrace eagerly any theory or demonstration that seeks to show that India was the original home of man, of the Indo-European peoples, of the Dravidians and so on, and to discount

heavily all evidence pointing to other conclusions. I wish to make it clear that I do not count myself among this class and that in my view the capacity to borrow and assimilate features from other cultures, or even to recognise a superior culture and adopt it willingly are signs not of weakness but of strength. I believe that this happened quite often in the past as it is happening to-day.

Of the earliest inhabitants of India it is not yet possible to speak with any certain or detailed knowledge. Even the astonishing discovery of the Indus valley civilization has raised more questions than it has answered. Individual scholars have 'proved' to their own satisfaction that the makers of this culture were Aryans who spoke Sanskrit or Dravidians who spoke Tamil. But the general consensus is that the key to the inscriptions on the seals that have been discovered has not yet been found, and that until they are satisfactorily deciphered, it would be wise to suspend judgment on the exact influence of that culture on the subsequent history of India. We must also discount claims for high prehistoric antiquity for finds from spots where the datable ones do not go beyond the early centuries A. D. or B. C. at the earliest. All that we know of the Indus valley civilization at present comes to this. Beginning perhaps some time in the fourth millennium B. C. and reaching fairly well into the third, there flourished in the Indus valley a complex urban civilization which bears a general resemblance, with many notable differences in detail, with the contemporary civilizations in the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates and of the Nile. Whether and how far it spread into the interior of India are questions still awaiting investigation. The relation of this culture to that of Vedic India is also a most moot question. 'The gap of darkness,' says Carleton, [20] 'between the day when Mohenjo Daro, Chanhu-Daro, Harappa, Amri, Alor and a dozen others were cities as Kish or Memphis, and the cloudy age when the Aryan incomers slowly emerge from legend towards history is as tantalizing as any break in human knowledge'. Having said this he proceeds to sum up his impression of the relation between the Indus culture and the Vedic culture tentatively as follows: : 'It must be recognised that the picture of the Dasus (Dasyus) a greedy, cunning, malicious race, inhabiting cities of fabulous wealth, possessing magical powers, yet unable to hold their field against their Aryan enemies — accords perfectly with the idea which we have formed of the people of Mohenjo-Daro, who were certainly a nation of traders, gifted and ingenious beyond common measure, rich in all that the known world could supply, incomparably more civilized than the early Aryans but definitely unwarlike'.

---

20. Patrick Carleton: *Buried Empires* (Edward Arnold) 1944 p. 162

More recent excavations at Harappa necessitate a modification of our estimate of the unwarlike character of the Indus valley culture. But the real crux is that while there is much evidence pointing to a catastrophe that overwhelmed this culture, we have as yet no proof that the Aryans were the real authors of its destruction.

The contribution of the Indus valley culture as such, 'to the sum of Indian civilization which is alive and vital to this day' is again not so certain as is often represented. Much has been made of a single 'roughly carved seal' in which, after much vacillation and with some reservations, Marshall proposes to recognise the prototype of Śiva. [21] But clearer and closer parallels to Śiva and Pārvatī, and to the nature of the organisation, ritual, and worship in Hindu temples as well as their structure can be found in the Sumerian and early Babylonian cultures and in that of ancient Egypt. [22] If we consider these far-flung resemblances together, the question arises if we are not dealing with survivals from a very early and widespread prehistoric culture which come before us only with the modifications they had undergone under the stress of the geography and history of each locality. Parmentier has attempted to trace such a common background for the building arts for whole area from Western Asia to Indo-China and Indonesia. With regard to the cult of the mother goddess, the phallic cult and the tree and animal cults prevalent in the Indus valley and their persistence in historical Hinduism, Marshall's explanations appear much more decisive and convincing. But even here the question I have suggested remains to be answered by further investigation, viz., whether these ancient cults do not form part of a heritage from a primitive culture, the range of which was much wider than we are now inclined to think.

Apart from the Indus valley people and their culture, philologists have been able to distinguish two major cultures in pre-Aryan India which from the languages of their authors have been called Kol or Muṇḍa, and Dravidian. To-day the former is the language or group of languages spoken by scarcely civilized people who form barely a hundredth part of the population of India. But it is unmistakably related to Nikobarese, Mon-khmer and other tongues forming the Austro-Asiatic group, which links up with the Austronesian group to form the 'Austric' family. It seems probable also that these Kol-Muṇḍa peoples once occupied a much wider area in Northern India, and shared in a widespread maritime

21 *Cultural Heritage of India* ii pp 21—3

22 *New Indian Antiquary* (1938) I pp 24 ff

culture with its own traditions and legends. The chief phonetic innovations in Indo-Aryan and some tales like those of Matsyagandhā and the *nāgī* of later Indian literature are now seen to be due more to Kol-Muṇḍa influences than those of Dravidian origin. On the other hand Dravidian languages have survived in much greater strength than Muṇḍa, and are spoken by about a fifth of the Indian population. These languages again are the vehicles of an old civilization and the extant literature of at least one language in the group, Tamil, carries us back to the early centuries of the Christian era. While Indo-Aryan practically displaced all other languages in Northern India and in Mahārāṣṭra, in eastern Deccan and the farther South, Dravidian languages survived in their full strength, though profoundly influenced by their contact with Indo-Aryan. In fact it is the present position of these languages that accounts for the *prima facie* assumption of modern scholarship that the most important pre-Aryan element which influenced Aryan in India was the Dravidian. And the island of Brahui speech in Baluchistan was then naturally interpreted as evidence of Dravidian speech having prevailed over much wider tracts if not over practically the whole of India before the Aryans came in. But as it becomes more and more evident that Indo-Aryan phonetics and morphology owed little to Dravidian influences and are almost fully explained by the presence of a Muṇḍa substratum, the geographical isolation of Brahui is perhaps best explained as due to a late movement in historical times brought about by causes similar to those which sent the Oraons and the Malers of Deccan to Chota Nagpur or spread some other nomadic tribes of the Deccan over the whole of Northern India as Sten Konow has shown (in Vol. XI of the Linguistic Survey). In the light of these important results, it becomes necessary to revise our notions of the cultural history of pre-historic India. To sum up the position as we see it now : the Aryans first came into contact with Kōl-Muṇḍa peoples over whom their cultural victory was so complete that their languages almost disappeared and their influence on Indo-Aryan speech was not suspected till the most advanced and minute technique of modern philology came to be applied to it in recent years. Indo-Aryan contact with Dravidians came evidently later, and while there is much evidence, still awaiting detailed study and analysis, of mutual influences of the vocabularies, there is little to show that Dravidian speech influenced the phonetics or the structure of Indo-Aryan [23]. It is only after a systematic study of the ancient borrowings between Dravidian

[23] On the whole question of the linguistic and cultural problems of Pre-Aryan India reference should be made to *Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India* by P. C. Bagchi (Calcutta. 1929) particularly Part 11 of the book *Sanskrit and Dravidian* by Jules Bloch, pp 35—59

and Indo-Aryan—and this was by no means an 'one-way traffic—that we shall be in a position to form a correct idea of the nature and content of pre-Aryan Dravidian culture. Another factor to be taken into account before authentic conclusions can emerge is the probability of Dravidian, like Sanskrit, having been influenced by the Muṇḍa languages, which are at least as old as Dravidian in India, if not older. Till these studies are completed, the scientific student will receive with caution the pictures often painted of the glories of Dravidian civilization, because he can never forget that early Tamil literature on which such pictures are based reflect conditions that prevailed long after the Aryanization of the whole of India.

The advent of the Aryan-speaking peoples was thus a great and indelible land-mark in the rise and growth of Indian culture as we know it, and the hymns of the Rigveda and Atharvaveda are its earliest documents. The cultural unity of India is a deliberate creation of these peoples who, though not possessed of an advanced material culture like the peoples of the Aegean basin and the great river valleys of Africa and Asia, had tamed the horse and evolved a masterful idiom wonderful alike in its beauty and flexibility—two things which secured for them an easy domination wherever they went—Greece, Italy, Iran or India. Aryan India is therefore a living historic reality that in its elastic strength has survived many a storm, and bids fair, once again, after some four thousand years from its inception, to essay, under the inspiration of a new born freedom, even greater tasks of cultural synthesis than of yore. It is the most notable achievement of the ancient Indo-Aryan leaders to have faced the problems of the conflict of cultures which confronted them with unexampled courage and understanding, and to have built up a society tolerant of wide diversities of all sorts, a fundamentally pluralist organisation of harmoniously co-operating groups owning a common allegiance to certain broad general principles that commanded more or less universal acceptance. That social organisation, warped and strained as it is by the impact of new forces and changed circumstances, still refuses obstinately to be 'reformed' out of existence. There is no lack of evidence that Hindu sociology assumed its definitive shape only after a fairly long process of trial and error, and the fascinating history of this process has not yet attracted to itself the attention that it merits. But the final shape it took is fairly clear, though it has often been misunderstood and misrepresented. On any unbiassed view the conceptions of *varṇa* and *āśrama*, of *dharma* and *svadharma*, of the *puruṣārthas* and of *karma*, *samsāra* and *mōkṣa* will be seen to provide a more comprehensive and satisfying code of social development than any of the

lop-sided revolutionary slogans evolved in the heat of the 'dialectic' conflicts of the Western world which have a fascination for some amongst us who glibly set themselves up as leaders of action to the detriment of our social economy. This is not an occasion when I can deal at any length with the principles of Hindu sociology, but I must say a few words on the role of *varṇa* or caste in our history. The tendency to the formation of classes was present in all Aryan societies, and it is well known that the Iranian polity presents a division of classes, four in number, comparable in some respects with the four *varṇas* of India. But nowhere outside India did these classes grow into the 'caste system' as we know it here. The stress on colour which the name *varṇa* implies doubtless formed a major factor in the evolution. But while the extermination of the original inhabitants has been the method of simplifying social problems of conquest in other climes and places, the Indo-Aryan exhibited a rare spirit of toleration and respect for the life and freedom of those who were not of his way of thinking, when he set about the creation of an integrated society in which everybody would have his place and find scope for pursuing his ends in his own way. It is not easy to account for the deep root which the principle of caste-division has taken in India and for the readiness with which new castes have formed themselves all through history and even continue to do so to this day, and for its multiform limitations on the contracting of marriages, taking of food, practice of occupations, methods of dressing and a hundred other things, except by assuming that much of it is a carry over from pre-Aryan social organisations. A good deal of pre-Aryan rites and practices survived in Aryanised India, and large parts of the Atharva Veda and the *gṛhya sūtras*, manuals of domestic ritual, bear the indelible stamp of these borrowings and adaptations. Very often the details of particular rites are not described, and it is simply stated that the practice of the family (*kula*) must be followed. And as if to leave us in no doubt whatsoever about this taking over from pre-Aryan society, at the end of his great manual, Āpastamba states expressly that knowledge gained from his work should be supplemented by learning what women and śūdras have to say as their lore is known to be the complement of the Atharva Veda, and women of all castes count equally for this purpose, Thus :

sā niṣṭhā yā vidyā strīṣu śūdreṣu ca /
ātharvaṇasya Vedasya śeṣa ityupadiṣanti /
strībhyas - sarvavarṇebhyaśca dharmaśeṣān pratīyādityeke /[24]

That to a relatively late stage the leaders of Indo-Aryan society did not mean to crystallize a caste system, but contemplated only a fluid

24. II, 29 11—12 and 16,

division into classes, becomes evident from a perusal of the discourses on caste and its origin and nature in the Śāntiparva of the *Mahābhārata*, and by the well known declaration in the *Gītā* that the *varṇa* of a person depends on his character and deeds. The defects of the caste system especially in its later developments are on the surface. It can be plausibly said that in it 'early colour prejudice is rationalized into a divinely appointed social order' [25]. Or 'it has broken up the unity of Indian life. It has prevented the growth of democracy. Among the higher castes it has engendered snobbishness and pride. Among the lower castes it has induced a spirit of inferiority and servility. Among all sections of the people it has hindered the development of a common humanity'. [26] We need not stop to scan such criticisms closely, but taking them in the broad sense in which they are meant, concede their general validity. But we should not also forget the historic role of caste in India. As one of the most competent students of the subject has recently pointed out: 'The system which has made it possible for so many and so different communities to live and develop together in common political units while retaining their own social systems and customs is the system of caste, and whatever drawbacks that system has and whatever injuries it involves, there can be no doubt but it has enabled the people of India to establish a stable society which has withstood and survived all military and political disturbances and the various vicissitudes of some three thousand years. That there is room for reform in its operation no one will question, but it should at the same time be recognised that the caste system has had and no doubt still has a value of its own in the integration and stabilization of Indian society, and it is doubtful whether without it such diverse racial and cultural elements could ever have been combined to the extent to which we find them combined at the present day. Indeed it is only against this background of almost incredible diversity of racial origin and of social custom that the phenomenon of caste can be appreciated and understood.' [27]

Before leaving Indo-Aryan India, let us sketch the main features of the culture it evolved and sustained through many centuries. Ancient India may be said to resemble Ancient Egypt in many ways except that Ancient Egyptian society could not survive the storms of history as Indian society has done. The paradox in either case is that while religion suffuses all human activity, earthly life is carefully cultivated and tasted to the full in all its advantages. It would be a mistake to imagine them as peoples who lived sadly ever in the

25. Kenneth Saunders: *Pageant of Asia* p.9.
26. H. Kabir: *Our Heritage*. P. 22
27. J. H. Hutton, *Caste in India (1946)*. pp 39—40

shadow of death and thoughts of the other world. Their material wants were few, and they met them singing at their toil, and working with patience and taste. They were essentially peaceful in their nature, and the reliefs on the *stūpas* and walls of temples as well as the paintings at Ajaṇṭā and elsewhere depict far more the themes of religion and peaceful human scenes than those of war and strife. Moreover, among these people the moral sentiment had gradually attained an exquisite delicacy, and the law of doing good (*dharma*) had taken definite shape. Morality assumed more and more a religious character until at last the individual was enabled to discover the fine distinctions of his conduct in the privacy of his conscience. The individual may not have expanded in this culture as he did in Greece for instance, but in the elaboration of pluralistic group life and its traditions, intelligence and morality played a part which explains the admiration of the rest of the world for that venerable wisdom, that knowledge 'old as the world'. For human unification which could, as much as the mastery of nature, be the proper work of civilization, India did much. And it was by normal law, rather than by violence and domination that she brought men together at home and in the colonies. 'Her just administration, her pleasant adornment of this life, her serene conceptions of the after life, all tempt the historian to ask himself whether, on the road which mankind is travelling in search of Paradise, the stage represented by Ancient India is not one of those in which it may sometimes have seemed that the goal was almost reached'.[28]

After the epoch of Aryanization the next great land-mark in the growth of the Indian culture-complex was the establishment ot Islamic polity in India. The rule of the Achaemenids in the North-West, like that of the Greeks, Śakas and Kushāṇas later, affected only the fringe of the Northern India. In the art of coinage and in the science of astronomy Indians gained very much by their association with the Greeks, and trade with the Roman empire by land and sea and Greco-Roman influences in the art of Gandhāra and Amarāvatī became important factors while they lasted. On a large view, however, nothing that happened in the early centuries B. C. and A. D. produced any great alterations in the make up of the population of India, the general content of their culture, or the lines of its development. We have little evidence on the numbers of the foreigners that entered India in this period, but whatever it was, they soon merged their identity in that of the children of the soil, adopted their modes of life, adored their gods, figured them on their coins and set up columns in their honour as Heliodorus did at Besnagar, and

[28] Cf. Henri Berr: Foreword to Moret's '*The Nile valley and Egyptian civilization*',

like Milinda (Menander) began to take a lively interest in the 'perennial philosophy' of India. There is reason to believe that the Huns came in somewhat larger numbers and that some of the Rajput families of mediaeval India were indeed of Hūṇa origin, though this has been denied; but after a short period of stormy violence, they too were assimilated completely with the people of the land which they had started by harassing. We have noted that Islam met with no success in India at the beginning of the eighth century when it was succeeding everywhere else, and India enjoyed immunity from the intrusion of foreigners for three centuries and more. Down to the eleventh century A. D. therefore Indo-Aryan culture found free scope for development and self-expression, and the external influences that played upon it only added new strands to its pattern without breaking its unity or lowering its vitality. During the time when darkness brooded over the Western world, India lived an intense political, intellectual, religious and artistic life, and built for herself a position of cultural primacy to which China, the other great land of civilization and culture in that age, rendered voluntary homage. It was the age when Buddhism brought India and China together and created a vast current of humanism which spread from Tufan to Java and from Ceylon to the furthest isles of the Japanese archipelago. It was the age of the great pilgrimages to the Holy land of the Gangā, the time of Mahāyānist idealism, the plastic art of the Guptas and the Pallavas, and of the illustrious Śankara at whose feet gathered all the scholars of his time like bees round the lotus. [29]

But towards the end of this long period, it was becoming clear that the meridian had been passed, and this did not escape the eye of the scholarly and sympathetic observer, Al-Biruni who notes: 'The Hindus believe that there is no country but theirs, no kings like theirs, no nation like theirs, no religion like theirs, no science like theirs......... If they travelled and mixed with other nations they would soon change their minds, for their ancestors were not so narrow-minded as the present generations'.

The Muslim conquest of Northern India was effected towards the end of the twelfth century after a bitter struggle which dragged its dreary length for the best part of two centuries. After a century of halt and such consolidation as the natural hostility of the conquered allowed, attempts followed in the fourteenth century to subjugate Deccan and

---

29. See Grousset: *In the Footsteps of the Buddha* (1932) and v. 39 at p. 40 of *Inscriptions du Cambodge* by G. Codes (1937)

South India; these efforts resulted in the formation of the independent sultanate of the Bahmani kingdom (1347) about a decade after the resistance of the Hindu South to Islam had found its focus in Vijayanagar (1336). The Mughal conquest of the North in the sixteenth century and of the south in the seventeenth was a relatively easier task. Beyond doubt large numbers entered India during these long centuries from the Islamic countries of Western and Central Asia and even beyond, for war, government, trade, literature and the arts; but many also went back and there is no certain means of determining the proportion of foreigners to local converts in the Muslim population of India. But as even the foreigners who settled in the country could not maintain their exclusiveness long and had willy nilly to mingle with the local Muslims, it would not be wrong to assume that in a general way there remains nothing except their religious faith to distinguish the Muslim population of India from their fellow countrymen.

But that difference proved to be a very potent factor in India's history. For the first time India came face to face with a Credal religion the fervour of whose exclusive faith had nothing in common with the broad tolerance of her original religions which in general tolerated almost everything except intolerance. And the followers of this exclusive faith became her conquerors and rulers. The result was that religion became from that time a motive force in the political life of the country which became split into two hostile camps. Even where it was not a question of open and organised resistance such as was offered by Vijayanagar, the Rajputs, Marathas and Sikhs, fear and suspicion poisoned the daily relations of the Hindu subjects and their Muslim rulers. Hindu rulers had to provide for the taxes which the Muslims imposed on their subjects making the pilgrimage to Benares. Hindu religious sects began to organise themselves on the model of Islam into exclusive and intolerant groups, and the Muslim state in India sometimes went the length of confining its relief measures to Muslims in times of acute famine, leaving the Hindus to take care of themselves. It has been recorded that the first mosque at Delhi dedicated to the 'Might of Islam'(Kuwat-ul-Islam) was erected (1198) on the site of a Hindu temple with the material drawn from 27 'idolatrous' temples that had ceased to be. That set the key to the normal policy of Islam in India.

But then as now, while the extremists on either side busied themselves in keeping up antagonisms and promoting conflict, good men were not slow to discover that perpetual antagonism between groups whose lot

was cast together was both unnatural and inhuman. They sought to create opportunities for meetings between Hindus and Muslims on more and more friendly and equal terms with results that declared themselves in the movements of religious reform and reconstruction both in Hinduism and Indian Islam, and in the fresh creative efforts that marked every sphere of the nation's life, its language and literature, its architecture and its painting, its music and dance. As a consequence of these adjustments, Indian Islam developed characteristics of its own reflected in Indo-Persian literature beginning with Amir Khusru and in the numerous monuments which form part of the heritage of India, though they have no place in the main stream of Persian Islamic culture. With rare breadth of outlook and statesmanlike vision, Akbar made a deliberate and well directed attempt to promote national solidarity by cultural eclecticism, political policy, and administrative action. He even built a temple in Kashmir and in the inscription on its walls in which he gave a warning to bigots, we seem to catch the echoes of Aśoka's famous Twelfth Rock Edict on Religious toleration. Akbar declared, 'He who from insincere motives destroys this temple, should first destory his own place of worship; for, if we follow the dictates of the heart, we must bear up with all men; but if we look to the external; we find everything proper to be destroyed'.[30]

But he was much in advance of his times though his aim evoked the admiration of Sivaji who wrote in 1680 to Aurangzeb; 'Akbar adopted the admirable policy of perfect harmony in relation to all the various sects. The aim of his liberal heart was to cherish all the people'. In fact the policy that Akbar followed and Sivaji applauded was the traditional policy of the Hindu state which never adopted the principle of *Cujus regio ejus religio*. Akbar's successors did not feel the same urge as he did to secure the rights of all his subjects and build up the unity of a national state. They found it easier to let their fellow Muslims have their way and did not command the energy or the will to oppose them. Prince Dara was a magnificent exception. Not merely as a matter of policy, but by conviction he appears to have conceived a genuine admiration for Hinduism. He cultivated Sanskrit, wore a ring on which was inscribed the word '*Prabhu*', and made the gift of a stone railing to the temple of 'Keshav Rai' at Mathurā.[31] But mainly on account of his love for Hinduism Dara lost both his throne and his life. In the past at any rate the Musalman has been singularly inconsiderate to people who did not share his faith and in India the taste of power over the *Kafir*

---

30. *Dara Sukoh* by K. R. Qaunungo (1935) pp. 401-2.
31. Ib p. 399.

corrupted him badly and his political record here contains little that is commendable. Writing soon after the Sepoy war of 1857 an English historian of British India summed up his impression of Indian Muslims and British policy towards them in the following terms: 'It is not probable that attempts to conciliate the Mohammadan population or soldiery will again be made ; all such efforts would fail - Mohammadans cannot be conciliated : the surrender of the country to their control would alone satisfy them. The conciliation of a bigoted sect, whose most cherished religious principle is ascendancy, is bad policy; concession adds to their strength - they attribute it to weakness or an act of homage to their rights, and are proportionately emboldened'.[32] Though we now see that the writer's forecast of policy was wrong, the course of Indo-Muslim politics in our time at once shaping the career of Mr. Jinnah and being shaped by it, goes a long way to confirm the soundness of this estimate in other respects.

From this point of view the failure to avert the partition of India and the carving out of a separate Pakistan is perhaps not an unmixd evil. It gives the more exterme followers of the Prophet who cannot brook the society of others the separate 'national home' which has been the goal of their ambitions during the last eight years or so; while other Muslims, and they are not few, who are more modern and tolerant in their outlook and can see that religion is everyman's private affair, and that groups of different persuasions can carry on a common social and political life together, will have no difficulty in continuing to make India their home. But they have been no friends of India or even of Indian Muslims who have played on passions that are easily excited in a manner that has promoted strife and practically ruined the good results of a century of modern administration. Let us hope that we have seen the worst results of their malicious policy, and that the Muslims who have chosen India as their home will make it their purpose to contribute to the unity and strength of the state while retaining their spiritual and cultural identity. Deen Darwish, a Muslim saint of the nineteenth century anticipated the sentiments of Gandhiji and some even of his very words when he sang:

Hindu Kahe son ham bade, musalman Kahe ham
ek mung kā do phand hai, kun jyādā kun kam,
kun jyādā kum kam, karṇa nahi kajiy
ek Rām ka bhagat_hai, duje Rahmanse raziy
kahe Din Darwish doy saritan mil ek sindhu
sahib sab-da ek hai ek Musalman Hindu

---

[32]. E. H. Nolan: *A History of the British empire in India.*

i. e. The Hindu says I am superior, the Musalman I; of one greengram there are two halves, which is more? Which less? Don't quarrel over who is superior and who is not. One is a devotee of Ram, the other of Rahim. Din Darwish says they are two streams mingling in one river. There is only one lord of all, the Hindu and Muslim are one.[33]

III.

The coming of the European nations meant for a long time little more than the opening of new channels of trade, and never involved any considerable change in the composition of the population of India. For well over a century after their arrival in India, the English were still worrying about placating the powers that be to secure a few privileges for the furtherance of their trade as against their rivals. "In 1711 the President of Fort William addressed the Nawab of Bengal 'with the humblest submission' laying at his feet 'that life wholly dedicated to your service'. Two years later the same suppliant, ingratiatingly described himself as' the smallest particle of sand, John Russell, President of the East India company with his forehead at command rubbed on the ground, approached the Emperor Faraksiyar." [34] But they soon learned from the experience of others, more venturesome though less steady, and set about actively realising their high destiny. Indian statesmen were not slow to observe what was happening. The young Peshwa Madhava Rao I, barely twenty-eight in age, had the prescience to write in 1772 (June 22) to one of his lieutenants: 'Now, you must remember never to allow the English to make a lodgement at Delhi. If they once obtained a footing, they can never be dislodged. Of all the European nations, the English are certainly the strongest. They have seized strategic points and have formed a ring round the Indian continent from Calcutta to Surat'. [35]

The balance sheet of India's relations with England is very complicated, and it is by no means easy to describe it within a short compass. The attitudes of both Englishmen and Indians have changed with changing conditions. In the early days of the company, factors took Indian concubines, wrote Persian verses, attended *mushairas* and nautches, and lived like Indians among Indians on equal terms; but they were also the days of corruption, private trade and the oppression of ryots and artisans; for the Indian society to which Englishmen fitted themselves was not the best even in that bad age. Then came Cornwallis who

---

33. Quanungo, *Dara Shakoh* pp. 380-1.
34. Garratt and Thompson: *Rise and fulfilment of British rule in India* (1934) pp. 54-55
35. Sardesai: *History of the Marathas* Vol. II

purchased the integrity of the Company's servants by raising their allowances in a manner calculated to render the Indian civil service the costliest, though efficient, service saddled on one of the poorest countries of the world. The events of 1857 and improved facilities of communication between England and India completed the process of social separation that high salaries had begun, and fear and suspicion began to dominate the mutual relations of Englishmen and Indians in India.

The attitude of Englishmen to Indian culture also changed perceptibly. Warren Hastings and Sir William Jones, Colebrooke and Wilson had respect for the learning and culture of the people over whom their country was gaining rule, and they were at great pains to understand their law, their philosophy, their religion, and their literature. But soon the attitude changed to one of neglect, if not contempt, and the meretricious glitter of Macaulay's rhetoric rationalized and confirmed the change; ever since it became the fashion for the average British official in India to carry himself as if his hard lot was cast in the midst of a barbarous people with whom he could have nothing in common.

On the other side Indians were struck by the power and efficiency of the West, and felt for a time that the salvation of India lay in their burning their old clothes and putting an all-Western garb. This mood was, of course, limited to a few at the top, and the bulk of the country knew nothing of it. But even with the 'educated few' the mood passed, and a better sense of values began to prevail. Reform and reconstruction from within, rather than superficial and uncritical imitation of other nations, became the accepted method of advance. In our own time two world wars and Mahatma Gandhi confirmed the new valuation of our heritage in relation to Western culture.

In fact the recovery of the ancient history of India and her culture by scientific methods is one of the happiest results of British rule in India open to much criticism along other lines. Our Vedic and classical texts have been edited and interpreted in a manner that has set the model for the future. Ancient inscriptions and coins have been recovered by the hundreds, and a methodical conservation of monuments undertaken. Acting generally, though by no means invariably, under English auspices, many scholars of continental origin have taken a large share in this work of recovering and reconstructing India's past, and it should be gratefully acknowledged that some of these have evinced a greater aptitude for the sympathetic understanding of the ancient culture and art of India than English scholars.

An allied aspect of the renascence of Indian culture is the rise of a modern literature in all the Indian languages, a movement in which Bengali gave the lead. And the system of education introduced after 1835 when English became the official language of British India was another. Its introduction was due not merely to the 'vigorous certainty' of Macaulay's famous minute which routed the 'Orientals' who were his foes in the famous debate on Arabic and Sanskrit *versus* English, bnt a proper response to the demands of Indians themselves who 'were clamouring to be taught English, and given modern Western knowledge'. And the system has not been 'the sweeping failure' that it is often stated to be. Thanks to it, many Indians have achieved a perfect mastery of the intricacies of English, and have learnt to 'express themselves with a nervous and sensitiive exactness and beauty which have made them free citizens of the kingdom of English thought and expression......and not strangers inhabiting it on sufferance and temporary licence'. [36] What is more important, it has given us a new bond of unity that serves the same purpose as Sanskrit in ancient times, and Persian under Mughal rule. It has put us into close touch with world-currents of thought and politics, of industry and trade, rendered us more conscious of the weakness in our position *vis-ā-vis* the other nations of the world and the more determined to remove them with the utmost possible despatch. Its influence has quickened all the Indian languages into a new life, although, I may observe in passing, some recent exhibitions of linguistic patriotism are far from being healthy or progressive. The need for remodelling our system of education so as to spread its benefits among the whole population as far as poasible, and make it more conducive to the immediate purposes of free India, is universally admitted; but one may doubt if it is recognised as clearly as it should be, that our need for higher education and research in all branches of modern knowledge, and for the maintenance and improvement of our world-contacts has become, today, after the achievement of our freedom, not less, but more urgent. The Englishman has quit India; some among us will apparently know no rest until they have sent out English after him. But are we sure we are not paying a heavy price for the unduly hurried departure of the Englishman? And should we not pause to think if the results of a premature expulsion of English may not be even more damaging?

Down to the outbreak of the first world war, in the eyes of Indian patriots the advantages of British rule in India outweighed its disadvantages, serious though they were. The blessings of internal peace and free-

---

[36], Garratt and Thompson, *op cit.* p. 662

dom from external danger, and of a settled uniform administration which bound the whole country into a political unity were fully appreciated, and criticisms of the administrative policy of government even from Congress were prefaced by asseverations of good will and loyalty to the rulers. All the same irritation was slowly mounting up at the enormous privileges arrogated by the English rulers to themselves and at the systematic sacrifice of Indian economic interests to those of the ruling country. The stormy and successful protest of the Englishmen in India against the Ilbert bill gave proof, that like their predecessors, the Mughal grandees, they were loath to think of Indians as men like themselves. Racial antagonism was accentuated by many incidents, great and small, until in 1919 the frightful shootings of General Dyer at Amritsar exasperated the whole nation and rendered the long continuance of English rule in India on any terms an impossibility. The destruction of Indian handicrafts at first by the protection of English industry against imports of manufactures from India, and later by competition from the machine-made goods of England that were guaranteed a free entry into India under an ostentatious policy of free trade, and the increasing pressure on land due to the decadence of industry and increase of population leading to the fragmentation of the already uneconomic holdings added to the poverty and misery of the people. The constuction of irrigation works and railways averted famines and improved communications, but unduly high rates of interest were guaranteed at the cost of the Indian tax payer for much of the English capital invested in these works, and the railway rates manipulated in a manner calculated to favour export of raw materials from India to England and the movement of manufactured goods in the opposite direction. With the Indian example in his mind J. S. Mill had said as early as 1861 in his *Representative Government*: ' The government of a people by itself has a meaning and a reality; but such a thing as government of one people by another, does not and cannot exist. One people may keep another as a warren or preserve for its own use, a place to make money in, a human cattle farm to be worked for the profit of its own inhabitants'. The truth of these statements was becoming increasingly evident with the lapse of every year.

From the beginning, however, there had been no lack of thinkers, statesmen and administrators in England who took a high and liberal view of England's work in India, and looked upon it as a sacred trust, a mission to prepare the people of India to look after their own affairs, and when that had been done to retire from India in a friendly and orderly way. Naturally their numbers were not many, and their influence

on Britain's Indian policy not uniformly effective. That is the reason why from the days of the incipient Indian legislatures of the nineteenth century to the second world war which begat the 'Cripps proposals' as we may call them for short, the expression 'too late and too little' is writ large on every instalment of political reform in India. But it is one of the glories of England that the idea of trusteeship in relation to India found its advocates in England in successive generations, and that in the midst of many hesitations and setbacks, the end of a free India was steadily kept in view, and Indian independence came at last to be declared by an Act of the British Parliament about a year ago. It ill behoves us to detract from the meed of praise rightly due to Britain, and argue that she withdrew from India because the end of the war left her too crippled in men and resources to be able to hold India and that any other colonial power in a similar situation would have acted likewise. We have only to look round and see what is happening in Indonesia and Indo-China to recognise the superior political wisdom of the makers of British policy towards India, Burma and Ceylon.

One wishes that were all the story. Unluckily that is not so. The English opponents of India's march to freedom generally succeeded in frustrating in practice the working of principles accepted by men at the top. Their weapons were political intrigue and administrative obstruction. Thus was Ripon's resolution on Local self-government bogged in a series of rules and regulations which ruined a valuable 'educational experiment' because of the unwillingness of English officials to work on equal terms with Indians.[37] The first prospects of a real and healthy democracy were blighted also by official intrigues which set up Musalman against Hindu and invented the 'communal electorate'. Again as it became clear that the end of British rule in India was becoming practical politics, they set about deliberately undoing their own work of political unification and got the princes of India to set up claims to a sovereignty which most of them had never possessed, promptly accepted those claims, and clung to the monstrous doctrine that the paramountcy which the East India Company had built up and made over to the Crown at its extinction could not be transferred to the Indian government. It is a matter of common knowledge that during the war years Lord Linlithgow in his desire to spite Gandhiji and the Congress, actively encouraged the most intransigent demands of Mr. Jinnah with consequences now well-known. In all these ways the freedom of India was sabotaged in advance, and the work of the first government of Free India rendered appallingly difficult.

---

[37] Thompson and Garratt: *Op. cit.* p. 539.

Yet when all deductions are made, there still remains much that is good and of enduring benefit to India in the work of England. Now that we are free to shape our destiny as we may, let us forget the evil and cherish the good, and like our ancestors of antiquity derive fresh strength for our national life by integrating into it whatever is good, useful and liberal in the great political and scientific tradition of England.